

10/667,263

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claim 20 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Ohtsuka et al, U.S. Patent 5,623,826 ("Ohtsuka"), Cohen et al, U.S. Patent 5,722,230 ("Cohen"), and Sharifi, U.S. Patent 6,109,038 ("Sharifi"), respectively. Claims 4, 8-13, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Monty, U.S. Patent 5,623,827("Monty"). Claims 4, 8-10, 13-15, and 17 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Heberling et al, U.S. Patent 5,540,056 ("Heberling"). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over McWhirter et al, U.S. Patent 5,743,206 ("McWhirter") in view of Takahara et al, U.S. Patent 5,450,725 ("Takahara"). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Heberling in view of Bensaadi et al, U.S. Patent 6,035,645 ("Bensaadi"). Claim 12 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over any of the above prior art applied to claim 4 in further view of Iwai et al, U.S. Patent 6,070,411 ("Iwai") or Ohtsuka. Claims 1-3 are allowed. Claims 5-7, 16 and 19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 8, 14, and 20 have been cancelled herein.

With regard to the rejection of claim 4 as being anticipated by Monty, claim 4 has been amended to include "a separate insert support for supporting the burner insert, the insert support disposed on a side of the burner insert opposed to the combustion chamber and protected from exposure to hot combustion products by the burner insert, the burner insert being removably attached to the insert support for selective replacement." In contrast, the structures of Monty cited in the Office Action are integrally formed, thereby teaching away from amended claim 4. See, for example, Monty, FIG. 2. Accordingly, Monty fails to support the rejection of amended claim 4 under 35 USC 102, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Heberling also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of amended claim 4. Notably, the member cited as reading on the "insert support" appears to be a non-

10/667,263

structural impingement plate 81. See, for example Heberling, FIG. 1 and 2, and column 5, lines 21-24. Significantly, it appears from FIG. 1 of Heberling that the dome plate 28, characterized in the Office Action as a "burner insert," is the primary structural support for the entire burner (note the feet of the dome plate 28 in contact with the liners 27, 29). This is different from the burner insert of claim 4 that is a non-structural member being supported by the insert support. Accordingly, Heberling fails to support the rejection of amended claim 4 under 35 USC 102, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested. For the above reasons, claim 4, and claims 9-12 depending therefrom, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

With regard to the rejection of claim 13 as being anticipated by Monty, claim 13 has been amended to include "a burner insert assembly ...comprising a burner insert ... and an insert support for supporting the burner insert...wherein the burner insert is removably attached to the insert support." In contrast, the structures of Monty cited in the Office Action are integrally formed, thereby teaching away from amended claim 13. See, for example, Monty, FIG. 2. Accordingly, Monty fails to support the rejection of amended claim 13 under 35 USC 102, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

Heberling also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of amended claim 13. Notably, the member cited as reading on the "insert support" appears to be a non-structural impingement plate 81. See, for example Heberling, FIG. 1 and 2, and column 5, lines 21-24. Significantly, it appears from FIG. 1 of Heberling that the dome plate 28, characterized in the Office Action as a "burner insert," is the primary structural support for the entire burner (note the feet of the dome plate 28 in contact with the liners 27, 29). This is different from the burner insert of claim 13 that is a non-structural member being supported by the insert support. Accordingly, Heberling fails to support the rejection of amended claim 13 under 35 USC 102, and withdrawal of the rejection is requested. For the above reasons, claim 13, and claims 15 -19 depending therefrom, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Claim 5 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of base claim 1 and any intervening claims from which it previously depended, thereby placing claims 5-7 in condition for allowance.

10/667,263

Reconsideration of the amended application in light of the above Remarks and allowance of claims 1-7, 9-13, and 15-19 are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



W. David Sartor (Reg. No. 50,560)

Beusse Brownlee Wolter Mora & Maire, P.A.
390 North Orange Ave., Suite 2500
Orlando, FL 32801
Telephone: 407-926-7724